DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 976 JC 720 133

AUTHOR	Morgan, Don A., Ed.
TITLE	The Two Year College Student: Unrest--Why and What to Do.
PUB DATE	Feb 71
NOTE	30p.; A report of a symposium held June 1970 under the joint sponsorship of Rochester State Junior College, and the University of Minnesota, Rochester Extension Center
AVAILABLE FROM	Director, Rochester Extension Center, University of Minnesota, 2120 E. Center Street, Building 4, Rochester, Minnesota 55901 ($1.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Activism; Community Services; Conference Reports; *Dissent; *Educational Change; *Junior Colleges; Social Attitudes; Social Change; *Student College Relationship; Student Leadership; Student Needs

ABSTRACT

Major issues relating to student unrest were discussed at a 1970 Symposium of the Two-Year College Student. The first two papers, "What Are Our Students Trying to Tell Us?" and "Students Demand Moral Leadership--No Less!" both deal with the need for reform in education to keep abreast with social change. Also discussed are the special problems of black students, and the need for effective social change based on trust, understanding, and acceptance of the democratic process. In "What Do You Mean--'Community College'?" various ways of serving the community are considered. The last paper, "A Student Leadership Training Project," describes a program for meeting the special needs of student activity leaders in junior colleges. (RN)

ED 062976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE TWO YEAR COLLEGE STUDENT:

UNREST - WHY AND WHAT TO DO

A report of a symposium held

June 1970

Under the joint sponsorship of

Rochester State Junior College, Minnesota

and

The University of Minnesota, Rochester Extension Center

Included are the principal addresses and invited papers

Edited by: Don A. Morgan

February 1971

College of Education
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

JC 720 133

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 27 1972

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

For sale by the Director,
Rochester Extension Center,
University of Minnesota,
2120 E. Center Street,
Building 4, Rochester,
Minnesota 55901.
Price: $1.50.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	iii
CHAPTER ONE - What Are Our Students Trying To Tell Us..... Charles E. Chapman, President, Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, Ohio	1
CHAPTER TWO - Students Demand Moral Leadership - No Less!..... Charles Hurst, Jr., President, Malcolm X College of the Chicago City Colleges, Chicago, Illinois	6
CHAPTER THREE - What Do You Mean - "Community" College?..... Don A. Morgan, Associate Professor of Higher Education and Educational Administration, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota	17
CHAPTER FOUR - A Student Leadership Training Project..... Robert Wise, Director of Student Activities, Rochester State Junior College, Rochester, Minnesota	22

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Preface:

The spectacle of massive student unrest at colleges and universities across the United States in the Spring of 1970 was viewed in varying degrees of alarm in the two-year college world. Not yet significantly involved in the tensions and expressions of frustrations, there were those of us in the Upper North Central region who were not satisfied to merely wait to see if the two-year colleges were to be involved. There is a feeling in California, for example, of "lead-time", by which is meant the time it takes a disturbance at the University of California to reach the community college campuses and during which there is time to react and prepare. It is not certain this is so elsewhere. At any rate, an examination of at least what the two-year college student seemed to be saying to those who were concerned about them seemed in order. The symposium reported here was organized under this premise -- to examine as President Chapman did, "What Are Our Students Trying to Tell Us."

It would be presumptuous to think all, or even nearly all, causes of student unrest were covered or discussed during the two-day symposium which resulted. Held at Rochester State Junior College and attended by over fifty participants from the Upper North Central Region, the symposium did, however, delve into some important reasons and causes of student unrest.

Not all the proceedings of the symposium are presented here. Many discussions were informal in nature with no tapes or notes taken and no manuscripts developed from which to work. However the major addresses and papers presented are included in this brief publication.

Plans were laid this first year to make the Symposium of the Two-Year College Student an annual affair. The 1971 session approaches final shape and will consider the Organization and Administration of Student Personnel Services. Hopefully the results of this will also be published.

Acknowledgements:

The idea for the symposium was the outgrowth of informal discussions with Drs. Wilbur Wakefield and Dean Swanson of the University of Minnesota's Extension Center in Rochester, President Hill of Rochester State Junior College and the writer. President Hill made the facilities of the college available for the program, while the basic burden of organizing the affair fell mostly on Drs. Wakefield and Swanson. Without them, the idea would have never reached fruition. Grateful acknowledgement is also given Mrs. Janis Aamodt who spent long hours on the grueling task of editing taped material and in typing the first draft.

February 1971

Don A. Morgan, Minneapolis

CHAPTER ONE

WHAT ARE OUR STUDENTS TRYING TO TELL US?

By

Charles E. Chapman[1]

To most of us, the time-worn "Three-R's" alliteratively call to mind the fundamental education provided by a knowledge of reading, writing and arithmetic.

Recently, though, commanding our attention, is an altogether different set of "R's": Radicalism, Rejection and Revolution. These words are certainly not new. The students using them are. What are our students trying to tell us? I don't believe we know precisely, for no one person or group speaks for all of youth and, further, not all youth are speaking--and those who are, are not speaking to all of us. However, there seem to be a number of concerns being expressed with increasing frequency.

In the larger social context, they are seeking change in nearly all of our social institutions. They call for more relevance in educational and religious institutions. They seek changes in priorities on the part of government on all levels. They seek an end to the war in Vietnam. They insist on the elimination of poverty and discrimination.

In all societies, groups and movements have developed to promote change in the status quo -- known collectively today as the establishment. The development of these counter-forces has been the rule rather than the exception.

As these forces collided with one another, the product was change. Fortunately, the change usually embodied progress. But all those generations of clashing forces clashed in societies much less complex than ours. The number of dominant forces and counter-forces in those societies was fewer, too, than in today's societies. This is not to demean nor to relegate as simplistic the changes sought by such figures as Luther, Locke, Jefferson or Gandhi. Rather, it is to suggest that in today's world of instant communication, innumerable factions, forces and fervors, the problems that confront us and the fragmented forces behind these problems are so complex as to challenge understanding and in some cases even analysis. But the challenge to analyze and understand these problems must be met.

---

[1] Dr. Chapman is President of Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, Ohio and the 1970-71 President of the American Association of Junior Colleges.

On our campuses, the students of today have some specific wants. They want the freedoms of the larger society -- the freedoms of speech, assembly, petition and dissent.

They desire carte blanche authority in the copy and dissemination of their publications.

They want an increased involvement in the affairs of the college -- in the decision-making processes, such as participation on faculty-administrative committees.

They are impatient with shoddy teaching. They feel qualified to participate in teacher evaluation. They eschew the notion of loco parentis -- they insist on independent action.

They desire a closer relationship with both the faculty and administration.

<u>They want to be heard</u> -- they want their opinions to be considered.

But, sadly, too many speak from isolated forums of disillusionment and distrust. The more radical among them even speak in terms of violent revolution. A large proportion regard dialogue, debate or the ballot as worthless, ineffective forces in their quests to effect change. Many are disillusioned and disenchanted with nearly all structured, ordered means for change.

I do not wish to overstate the current malaise. Unrest on the part of youth is unique neither to the second half of the twentieth century nor to the United States. Through the ages, youth has traditionally been the questioner, seeking answers and effective roles within systems it had not built. The motives of these questioning youth, contrary to the opinions of many adults, are usually virtuous and sincere, rather than contemptuous. Many historical figures, labeled radicals in the heat of their confrontations, are viewed in retrospect with veneration. And many of the secure, self-righteous establishments and institutions which bulwarked against the radicals stand today only as abstractions in historical text. (A simple example -- the theory of the divine right of kings).

Many of those who feel strength or moral advantage in being established gain their false sense of security by ignoring the historical and social processes that have created change throughout history. We would be better

served to reserve some of the time we spend establishing our bulwarks to ponder the verity that any institution worth perpetuating is worth questioning.

In the process of hearing youth's questioning, we may at times have to suffer tedious flows of non-constructive diatribe and inane tirades, but we will surely also be startled by some of the logic and validity to which they seek to alert us. We should welcome such a startle. As America's great British friend, Edmund Burke, said at the time of this nation's 18th Century revolution:

> "I like a clamour wherever there is an abuse. The fire-bell at midnight disturbs our sleep; but it keeps you from being burnt in your bed."

I spoke a moment ago of the challenge to analyze and understand our numerous problems. This task is further complicated by the unique complexity of today's American Youth. The range of values, attitudes and interests of these young people is perhaps the greatest of any population in history. They vary in myriad degrees on a political and philosophical spectrum from the extreme right to positions of alienation so far adrift to the left as to relish warfare on this society. Between these regrettable extremes are gradations almost as numerous as youth's population.

The extremists represent a very small minority and are not representative of youth. As Leo Rosten pointed out recently, polls have shown that youth do not support self-appointed leaders. Militants make the headlines; they force police to use force to make martyrs; but at the campus polls, youth's "leaders" are consistently rejected by their "followers".

Adding complexity to our understanding of today's youth and further distinguishing him from his ancestors is that he looks to a greater degree than his predecessors into himself -- to his own conscience and intellect -- to find answers to immediate and personal questions.

To him, the time tested answers have become platitudes and have lost some of their validity. Tell a student to work hard and save for the future, and he may ask you, with complete honesty and sincerity, why? An explanation of the lessons of the virtues of thrift and hard work, driven home by the great depression, may arouse little more than a shrug. Then, he tells you about a bomb that could obliterate an entire culture in minutes, about a war he doesn't understand but in which he may have to participate -- about millions of people who are denied basic human dignity through prejudice or poverty. To many, disaster is close, immediate and all inclusive.

Discuss education with this youth and he may boldly underline the gap in the generations with attitudes quite different from most of ours in our student days. He may label many college curricula as relevant only to business.

The student is not saying you are wrong by bringing up these questions. Instead, he is really asking you for an explanation -- your explanation -- of the difference between the problems of the 1930's and 40's and those of the 1970's. How do you reconcile the solution of two different sets of problems with one set of answers. He wants an explanation and will evaluate adults on the basis of their replies. Too often, his evaluation is that we are hypocritical or, worse, that we are unconcerned.

What, then, are we to do about it? I would suggest three major changes:

1) We must construct lines of communication where they do not exist and strengthen those that have withstood the strains of disenchantment. We must, also, be prepared to receive the expressed concerns of our young people with a new attitude of sensitivity and responsiveness and with a willingness to re-examine our values, priorities and ideas.

An attitude of responsiveness in our efforts to communicate with youth is a major part of what is needed to take the necessary strides toward the solutions of many of today's problems. The need for responsiveness over inaction is of utmost importance in making any progress with those who have classified the adult establishment as both unapproachable and stagnantly stationary in its hypocrisy.

2) Once communication has been established, we must create situations and contrive experiences through and by which youth (and adults) have the opportunities requisite to learning and understanding the democratic processes.

Through personal experiences we must attempt to create an understanding and an acceptance of the inherent slowness, frustration and tedium, as well as the ultimate efficacy, of the democratic processes. We must not be afraid to make them aware of their own shortcomings. When their inexperience in problem solving and their lack of skills and inclination to understand and work-out dilemmas are manifested in "all-or-nothing" reactions or threats, we must point out the immaturity of such reactions. They must see their own hypocrisy mirrored in their violations of due process. We must make very clear to all quarters the utter indefensibility and intolerability of violence as a form of protest. We must reiterate such lessons as Rousseau's centuries old warning:

> "...If force creates right, the effect changes with the cause: Every force that is greater than the first succeeds to its right. As soon as it is possible to disobey with impunity, disobedience is legitimate; and, the strongest being always in the right, the only thing that matters is to act so as to become the strongest. But what kind of right is that which perishes when force fails?"

We must all recognize the existence of a vehicle for change which does not require bullets, bombs or outrage to be viable. But more important than tacit recognition, youth must be urged to become a part of this system -- an active part of democracy.

Many young people are already reaching out to us in this last area. We see that many of them want to become more involved, in more effective ways, in the decision making processes. This is evidenced in increased political awareness and activities -- including such campaigns as lowering of the voting age and recent influences brought to bear on Congress. It is also manifested on the college campus with more students wanting a stronger voice in matters of curriculum, faculty evaluation and other concerns.

The older generation often publicly frowns upon these movements for student involvement and college administrators often simply ignore their demands. This seems to me to be an extremely unfortunate situation, since by stifling the requests of these students for more responsibilities we are, in effect, sabotaging our supply of future leaders and further retarding the initiation of youth into participatory democracy.

A nation that ignores or gives up on its youth has no future.

It is unfortunate that our youth have not been so initiated. This is largely the fault of us adults. Education has been negligent -- from kindergarten through graduate schools -- in providing an environment in which young people can learn to work effectively with the democratic processes. Throughout a student's years of education, his basic experiences in learning these processes usually consist of a high degree of authoritarianism on the part of his teachers, school administrators and Boards of Trustees, polyannaish or at least simplistic social studies classes and exposure to highly mechanical student governments that have only cursory authority and insignificant influence.

They are not taught that democracy is imperfect -- that elections mean losing as well as winning, that inherent is the need to compromise.

They too often define compromise as asking for twice what they want and accepting half rather than recognizing it as middle ground between divergent views. We must re-educate to fill this gap in understanding.

We must express such messages as John Morley's when he wrote, "Harmony of aim, not identity of conclusions is the secret of the sympathetic life". Youth must understand that a majority of Americans are in full agreement on such aims as peace, adequate income and housing. They must also understand that there may be a divergence of opinion on the means of realizing these aims.

Other untaught lessons in the democratic way of life include that means must be consonant with ends; only in the absence of freedom do ends and ends only justify the means.

It must be understood that, as previously stated, democratic process involves careful and often tedious processes. In a world so accustomed to instantaneousness, the lack of it in democracy and due process must be understood and accepted.

There is a broad lack of understanding relative to the incorporation of democracy's precepts and ways of living into our educational system. As stated by Edward C. Lindeman in perhaps the definitive work on democracy,

The Democratic Way of Life:

> "...The democratic way of life cannot be taught merely through the introduction of various items about democracy in the curriculum. It is, of course, important to inform children and youth regarding democracy's origins and ideals but this provides no assurance that students thus informed will automatically acquire democratic habits and loyalties.
>
> It is difficult, if not impossible, to be faithful to an idea or an ideal which has not been experienced...Knowledge of democracy acquired in democratic experiences is likely to produce democratic habits. The democratic way of life, in other words, does not consist of a system of beliefs but rather a cluster of habits..."

3) Many pessimists and cynics would regard this democratization-as-panacea unworkable. They would point to the retarding influence of such young cynics' slogans as "you can't trust anyone over 30". I feel that this slogan is a myth! Trust has no relativity to age. Trust is based on positive relationships among people. It is obvious that these experiences and relationships are lacking -- there is much distrust. But these patterns of positive inter-personal relationships can develop -- among people of all ages, races and persuasions. To establish trust on the campus level, we must establish procedures by which legitimate and reasonable student requests are given full consideration -- the absence of which bespeaks arbitrariness and authoritarianism on the part of the college. This polarizes positions and can lead only to frustration, probable confrontation and possibly repression. It is basically a matter of involvement and a commitment to the concept of the dignity of all people.

CONCLUSION:

Simple answers do not exist. We must face some unpleasant facts: we have failed with respect to teaching democracy; we <u>are</u> in the midst of a social revolution, but the vast majority of the changes called for by youth are highly positive and consistent with the concepts on which

this nation is based. Dramatic social change is not new to this country; we must be prepared for the re-examination and re-evaluation of our priorities and our values.

We must rediscover a generation of American youth. This can be done in an environment of mutual trust and rationality.

Without an understanding, acceptance, and utilization of the democratic processes, and without the existence of mutual trust, we cannot achieve a climate which will nurture understanding. And without understanding, we will likely sink into a quagmire of distrust, frustration, anger, repression, and conflict.

CHAPTER TWO

STUDENTS DEMAND MORAL LEADERSHIP--NO LESS!

By

Charles Hurst, Jr.[1]

The country is in real trouble today, and the most important single explanation of why, as I see it, is the absence of a clearly defined, explicit, and accepted mission for the education enterprise. The important objectives of human efforts, as taught in our schools, and the hierarchy of human values are ill-defined or confused, and in any case not well supported. It should be elementary that the education process must above all else help to provide answers to problems such as those of poverty, race relations, peace, and personal identification. As long as it does not, we will have all kind of confusions on our campuses and in our society. All of this emphasizes that the United States, in my judgment, is in a state of debilitating moral crises that has a relationship to what it is we are supposed to be doing in our schools today.

This American crises, extending from the racism which is an inherent part of our system, is a failure to develop a contemporary ethic upon which an honest morality structure to combat racism can be built. It has left this country and its leaders in a state that finds benign paternalism, materialism, and repression superseding all else. A concern for values such as human life, human dignity, and the unimpeded opportunity to pursue happiness remain in a veritable shambles.

It is indispensible to my thesis that I note educational curricula portray an effort to make an enlightened whole of a human being while actually emphasizing the opposite by teaching the superiority of professional specialization and scientific achievements. Now it may be important to state unequivocally at this time a recognition that one very important role of education is the training of people to meet the professional and technical manpower needs of our society. But this is not the most important role of education. The competence that I think education must develop, must grow out of the willingness on the part of the education institution to humanize itself, and to function as an agent of dynamic and radical social change. This role has been rejected by too many educational leaders.

---

[1] Dr. Hurst is President of Malcolm X College of the Chicago City Colleges. He is also a member of the American Association of Junior Colleges Executive Board.

In the decade since Sputnik an unprecedented escalation of world-wide tensions has occurred--Viet Nam, Africa, and now Cambodia. The last year has been one of increasing rebellion by the youth in the United States and has been increasingly felt on campuses. Flaming explosions of discontent in the streets of most major cities of the United States continue despite the fact that papers are relegating it to the back pages or not reporting it at all (in the hope, I guess, that if the folks in their town don't find out about it they won't become contaminated). But the fact of the matter is that in America there are people dying in the streets, there are people who are burning, there are people who are engaged in violent conflict with law enforcement agencies of the United States government--now!

All of the ingredients then for a final resolution of our problems seem present in the words uttered by one of the most liberal persons in the Senate, Margaret Chase Smith, who indicated she would rather have repression over anarchy. I asked myself, "My God who's going to be left to define the term anarchy?" That it is a frightening future we face ought to be alarmingly clear. But the present situation, I want to emphasize, is brought on because education was caught bringing up the rear on countless moral and humanistic issues. This is an intolerable condition, if only because faulty developmental foundations become the basis for internal decay--individually and nationally.

Thus, at every level the education industry must reassert its responsibility by providing moral leadership in all affairs. It must hold itself accountable to the people for the behavior of institutions which play such an important role in shaping lives, attitudes, personal characteristics, as well as the national perspective.

In order that education be the moral force so urgently needed, a critical reappraisal of current curriculum and instructional practices is necessary. Education is going to have to become actively involved in inspiring new solutions or new approaches to desired solutions of our social ills. Education must become involved in educating for changes that will improve life conditions for the unhappy millions of deprived people in our world. Demanding that all concerned people set aside the tendencies toward parochialism and self-interest and use their talents and energies in the direction of promoting the causes of justice and humanity in every possible way, the school must exist as a counterrevolutionary force to the immense efforts still enslaving mentalities and corrupting irrefutably the spiritual being of humans.

Instead a kind of moral corruptness has been exhibited in education. A poor kind of leadership has been shown our students and thoroughly confused them about the role of education. Certainly it is tragic that the education industry

did not speak out properly when college students were ruthlessly slaughtered during the frantic expressions of their despair and discontent in the spring of 1970. It matters that students are beginning to ask the questions about humanism that this society is unprepared to answer or deal with. They ask, is it right for human beings to kill each other at Kent State, Jackson State or in Viet Nam? The answer ought to be coming swiftly - "No!" Is it right for human beings to exploit each other? The answer ought to be coming equally quickly - "No!" Those in educational roles should not be equivocating on these kinds of questions in terms of their answers - not if we expect to do something about the confusions and discontents that are perplexing us as expressed by our young. The matters of poverty, discrimination, war, human exploitation, ecological corruption, and gross disparities, and inequities between people of the world are of paramount concern and must be kept constantly visible by the education industry as a prelude to a search for answers.

It seems to me that those in the educational enterprise have to be the ones to constantly speak out with a position rather than exhibit the kind of equivocation too often found. The willingness on the part of people in the universities to retreat into their ivory towers, and the seeming willingness on the part of their counterparts in the community colleges to emulate them in this, as they do in so much of what has become traditional in the four-year colleges, is unjustifiable. It is an abdication of moral responsibility--of leadership. Because of the nature of the charge given us in most of our institutional charters, we have to be very, very concerned with all kinds of inequities including those exhibited in major urban settings. To do so is moral leadership.

It ought to be rather elementary that the ignoble record of white America in the treatment of black America is an example of the kind of confusion being created in the world today. Discriminatory treatment is getting worse rather than better, contrary to what some think. To their discredit, the President, the Congress, and many in education and religion debate on and on as to whether black people shall be given justice and equal rights. The tale of oppression of black people has been documented. In order to frighten everybody, whether they're members of the Black Panther Party or members of some other party that's exactly the opposite, doesn't make any difference, there is an almost endless list of examples of continued injustice in this country. This leads to severely embittered young black people, and the result is the systematic elimination from community service of urgently needed young leadership. It gives a sort of credence to the charge by many of a calculated program of genocide practiced against black people. The definition of genocide provided by the United Nations in 1946 in my judgment certifies use of the term genocide as

appropriate to describe the conditions and pathology in governing the way black people are forced to live and die in the United States. This could also be applied to other minorities in our society. The racists system which encourages and perpetuates injustices against minority group people contaminates all other aspects of American life and the educational systems in America. Aside from proven physical brutality in many forms by police, there is the large scale psychological brutalizing that occurs in the nations schools.

Dr. Galagher, former President of the City College of New York, in a recent address, warned of the nation's apparent inability to solve critical problems of race, pollution, over-population, violence, war, and drugs. Regarding racism and violence, he said, it would be a bold man indeed who tried to assert on the record that we have made progress--we have not made more progress, we have lost ground. We are losing the struggle against racism and its attendent violence. Galagher pointed out also that higher education in the coming decade must place those larger social problems on its agenda. Colleges and universities can no longer wait on the glacier movement of the generations, retreat into the ivory towers, rely on repression and intimidation to get them through troubled times.

Administrators and faculty members and students together will come up with the answers to these problems or they will go down together with a sinking ship. Such progress as we can discern is like sunlight reflecting from a sea of blood and tears. Yet there are those who say we've made enough progress, and you should not be a prophet of doom. And I'll be damned if I'm a prophet of doom, I'm just telling the Goddamned facts like they are and I would tell them as long as I have a breath in my body to do exactly that. It is very peculiar to me that I should go to places as I did about two weeks ago, it was a commencement exercise--all white--invited by the students, of course, and forced upon their parents against their will. And I said some of these things in a much milder tone because I knew where I was, and I had to be escorted to get out of there. It took six cops surrounding me to make certain I didn't get hurt. That in itself was affirmation of what it was I was trying to say, that we are not moving forward, except in the minds of some who refuse to face the facts.

Further evidence of deteriorating human and civil rights are found in recent court decisions. A federal judge upheld the Army's right to infiltrate civilian groups and compile intelligance reports on individuals ranging from Viet Nam war protesters to civil rights activists. During the court hearings, a Justice Department attorney acknowledged that the Army compiles intelligence reports on individuals, aimed at helping identify potential trouble makers in the event the

Army may be called in to deal with civil disturbances. Two former Army intelligence agents whom the judge refused to hear as witnesses, said that they helped compile reports on such persons as the late Martin Luther King and Julian Bond; folk singer Joan Baez and Dr. Benjamin Spock; and surprisingly enough, several Army generals who oppose American involvement in Viet Nam. This is ridiculous as a society capable of sustaining its basic principles and of renewing itself will find means to provide for and profit from dissent, rather than ways to repress it. We must realize that freedom itself could be irretreivably lost through such repression. To assert that a government may ignore basic human rights to some degree and in some cases so that it may most expeditiously deal with outrages and irresponsible elements is to show an underlying contempt for our democratic processes.

Senator Percy has called for a rejection of the politics of fear, and its replacement with solutions based on greater responsiveness. And I think this is the key work for us as college administrators - responsiveness.

Taken as a whole, the facts of life in America today represent why I, as a black college president, sympathize unequivocally with efforts to revolutionize education, rehumanize our society (and believe these are irrevocably intertwined) and eliminate racism as a factor in all the institutions which shape and control the lives of our people. A great tragedy of our time is that our educational institutions have not accepted a responsibility for sophisticating people about questions of racism. As a consequence most people, even though they have the most advanced degrees available in our society today, know little or nothing about racism--they should ask a ten year old kid who has been victimized on a continuing basis by racism. But aims such as mine can only be accomplished if our society becomes willing to incorporate at every level an intellectual honesty that recognizes fully the right of all other Americans to be free and equal participants in this country's affairs. The road to needed insights and solutions will not be easy. It seems to me imperative to preface any conjecture about the future with the realization that the present situation of discrimination, unequal justice, brutality, deplorable oppression, and intolerance is more likely to get worse than better. We can work towards changing the certainty that matters will become worse.

Quite ironically, much of white America viewed Malcolm X as being anti-white, and still do today. Martin Luther King is viewed by most of the white society as non-violent and Eldridge Cleaver is viewed as being an irreversible rapist. All of these conclusions are erroneous and misleading. They emphasize the peculiar ability of this nation to assign men catagorical labels. And they also give sharp indication of the superficiality of understandings on the part of most white

people about racism and its consequences. And this superficiality is probably one of the most profound factors in the need for expensive programs of social research involving the impact of white racist attitudes on educational practices.

In fact, Malcolm X was a non-racist. He proclaimed one's right to be human was non-negotiable. Yes, he was at one time a racist, but because of his broadened exposures he became a non-racist and asserted the inalienable right of the human spirit to exist as the free and exhaulted exemplication of God's will. Martin Luther King was engaged in a violent struggle, a struggle to protect his right to be non-violent and to reveal violence as an inherent part of American life even if it cost him his own. Cleaver, a convicted rapist, pointed out through his writings that a rapist system inevitably produced rapists. Cleaver's pleas, as with the pleas of the other protesters of the 60's, was simply that man's inhumanity to man was a dehumanizing process that must cease if we are to exist as people.

Now, these men, as I see it, laid the foundations for the new kind of post-high school experience that we have to be concerned with. Their college was the community itself - street corners, stadiums, churches, jails, dance halls, store fronts, picket lines, stages, bars, and so on. The content of their curriculum was real life; the Birmingham bus strike, the Memphis strike, the march on Washington, the New York school integration struggle, and so on. Above all it was emphasized that learning and doing are inseparable. The authentic role of education was revealed as the liberating of people, the eliminating of all injustice, and the convincing of all people of their essential educatability, worth and humanity. This is what an education that is relevant must be about. And this is what the students of all shades are protesting about. They don't have the answers, all they have is their discontents, but their discontents, I would suggest, are very well founded.

Finally, and this is an issue that I feel must be resolved for all blacks and whites and it must be most firmly resolved in the minds of those who are leading education, the notion of black inferiority and the myth of white supremacy. Both must be relegated to the human junk pile where they belong. One of the major consequences of racism in America is that large numbers of white people are convinced that they are greater and that they are more intelligent human beings solely because they are white. And on the other hand, large numbers of black youth are being convinced very early in life that they are inferior because of the color of their skin. A situation must evolve where the average young minority member does not have to get up in the morning and say, "I am somebody!" He will know he is somebody and will have confidence in a heritage of which he is a part. This is to suggest the rejection of a curriculum that does not attempt to do these things. No member of any minority group can reconcile himself

to a curriculum that ignores this important facet of responsibility for education.

There are also the questions of unity, and the current acceleration of threats against the individual freedoms. Everyone ought to be aware of some current developments of great significance and which involve the Army of this country, operating within the country. I call your attention to the book, The Man Who Cried I Am. It tells something about the "King Arthur Plan". Many Americans still do not even know what the "King Arthur Plan" is, but it is real enough in the minds of hundreds of thousands of young black men. There are very few meetings of young black people where it isn't mentioned. The "King Arthur Plan" is related to the super-highways; it is related to what are called concentration camps, uninhabited at the present time in several parts of the country; and it is related to the massive collection of computerized data that the Army is collecting on all kinds of people. I don't know what is to come of it, but I think it has some relevance for education, the kinds of curricula that we develop, the kinds of instructional methodology that we utilize.

I underscore that my hopes for the future are not altogether negative. I think they are very realistic. I can't afford to live in any kind of dream world. Four times this past year young blacks were killed in our community of Chicago. You know them as a statistic or as the law enforcement agencies represent them. I knew them as human beings; I knew them as looking exactly like my son, or like my cousin, or like myself. I knew them as people of tremendous potential. And I see their loss as being a great loss for our society. We have to do something about it. We have first to be realistic in assessing what's going on around us today if we have any hope of doing something about it. Then our curricula and the structure of our institutions and our attitudes toward people have to reflect an interest in doing something about it. I think we have to be concerned, very frankly, with the notion that the young black Americans are a different breed of Americans than we have ever seen before. They are yearning for power and participation, not in a negative sense.

Young blacks recognize that the education of all people, black and white, ought to go on outside as well as inside of the classroom. They recognize, they taught me, that formal credentials are not a prerequisite to teach each other, and that the educational experience must encourage all people to acquire the skills to humanize their own existence and to protect their right to be who they need to be.

The characteristics of a search for black liberation through education comes very clearly out of all of this. To fail to respond to the imperative I am trying to articulate is to continue the education of people to participate in

the destruction of their own identities and cultures and to substitute what for them are the oppressor's values for what ought to be their own. Education for black liberation can be a model involving humanistic and moral principles built on certain givens: (1) - All children and youth are human and educable, a fact which ought to be regarded as irrefutable, but is not; (2) - Education must be open-ended for all--what I have against technical programs is they tend to put the lid on somebody, to direct people into dead-end programs; (3) - Black people hold in common African descendency and victimization by white institutional racism and they, as well as their white student counterparts, ought to know the details of this; (4) - All people ought to know that to support racism is to participate in one's own destruction and that education which effectively overlooks human aspirations in favor of only technical survival requirements is irrelevant; and (5) - Education for black people becomes essentially a retooling process in order to rehumanize.

It must be understood that black people, black men in particular, have a right and an obligation to define themselves and the terms by which they will relate to other people. And education then becomes a process that educates for liberation and survival and nothing else. Intellectual liberation, psychological liberation, economical liberation, all of these are important, but underlying these must be that common denominator--liberation, liberation and cultural survival.

CONCLUSION:

Ultimately then the education of people must free them from psychological dependence on others and teach them to think and act on their own. And this ability does not reside solely on intellectual talents, but on the ability of one to rid himself of the need to be controlled by other people. Education must provide students an opportunity to select, design, and articulate their own values and to discern the impact of these values on their behavior, their attitudes, and their relationship with others. We have to inculcate in the minds of every single individual in the United States a near worship for freedom. Freedom must be recognized by every single individual in the kind of country that we live in, as the most important commodity of human existance--whether you be black, white, red or yellow. But freedom must be something that you are willing to give the ultimate for - your life. The recognition must be that if you are not free, then you are existing a life that is not worth living. And you cannot demarcate on the basis of white American, black American, oppression from the outside, threats from the outside, from oppression from the inside and threats from the inside. It must be understood that when a Black Panther says, "Give me liberty or give me death," he is simply espousing the same kind of noble thought that Patrick Henry was espousing when he said the same thing.

What do we do in order to change education? Let me be very clear. We have to change our disciplinary patterns, we have to change our grading patterns, and most important, we have to change the relations between the teacher and the student, and those of the student and other aspects of college life. It is time we went about it.

CHAPTER THREE

WHAT DO YOU MEAN - "COMMUNITY" COLLEGE?

By

Don A. Morgan*

Serious questions must be raised as to whether the "new" community colleges have already failed collectively to contribute anything really "new" or "unique". Clearly if these colleges are to succeed, they will do so by actions rather than words, and these actions must be geared to include rather than exclude members of the community and the community itself.

The increasing numbers of two-year college students do not appear at the college door out of the blue. The source is still the community; however, any one college may define this term and regardless of the actual posture of the colleges towards this source of supply. There are many new community colleges recently organized to serve these students,[1] and not unexpectedly there are degrees of unsureness at any one college as a result of so much newness. One result of this is that new institutions, as well as many of the ones established previously under the titles of junior colleges or technical institutes, increasingly describe themselves as comprehensive community colleges,[2,3] with little evidence to support the suggestion that these colleges are sure of or understand the enormous social responsibilities they tacitly accept by so describing themselves.

---

[1] Harper, W. A. (editor): 1970 Directory, Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges. 1970. Page 8.

[2] Gleazer, E. J. Jr.: This Is the Community College. Washington D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, Houghton-Mifflin. 1968. Page 22.

[3] Martorana, S. V.: "Values and Variables in Organizing and Financing Public Community Colleges," in Technical-Vocational Education and the Community College. Williamsburg, Virginia: Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Legislative Work Conference of the Southern Regional Education Board. August 1964. Page 53.

* Dr. Morgan is Associate Professor, Educational Administration and Higher Education, University of Minnesota, and the immediate past president of Big Bend Community College, State of Washington.

All involved are personally and directly culpable for the present situation. No one working within the framework of the modern two-year college can escape this responsibility. The community-junior colleges have collectively asserted to their supporting society that they can meaningfully involve the community, that they can do what all other post-secondary institutions have failed to do -- include rather than exclude students, that they can prepare individuals for a valuable role in life as these individuals perceive this and as society accepts them -- in short to be a humanizing social agent rather than to serve merely as another variation of dehumanizing institutions. To make these assertions is to raise the hopes of many people previously denied the benefits of higher or continued or worthwhile education. It is important that these raised aspirations be clearly understood. Involved are fearful responsibilities and enormous challenges with little evidence that the colleges involved realize this.

Pontifications, stated as goals and proudly presented in catalogues, are not always translated into performance. For example, the moment a "community college" takes principal joy from being described as, or aspiring to be described as, a "little Harvard" is the moment disaster is courted if the aspiration and needs of students and the community they come from are indeed the purposes for the college's existence. The disaster referred to is that of these new colleges merely repeating the practices of other educational institutions which came, and continue, to be in practice social agencies which are geared to exclude humans rather than to include them.

Venn stressed the relationship between education and occupational opportunity:[4]

> It is the thesis of this report that technology has created a new relationship between man, his education, and his work, in which education is placed squarely between man and his work. Although this relationship has traditionally held for some men and some work (on the professional level, for example), modern technology has advanced to the point where the relationship may now be said to exist for all men and for all work. Yet, though technology today in effect dictates the role that education must play in preparing man for work, no level of American education has fully recognized this fact of life. Tragically, the nation's educational system is, when viewed as a whole, in what Edward Chase describes as a gross imbalance, its attention concentrated on the 20 percent of students who go through college.

---

[4] Venn Grant: Man, Education and Work. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education. 1964. Page 1.

And Rodriquez has written regarding the final significance of the excluding tendencies of all public educational institutions:[5]

> Genocide is not limited to annihilation by physical force. Educational genocide has destroyed generation after generation of Blacks, Browns and other minorities in our country. The next decade must see, if this society is to survive, the elimination of all vestiges of an educational system that has been geared to exclude instead of include. Education must assume the responsibility for the past programs of cultural, linguistic extermination--and it must assume the responsibility for creating a new system that produces young individuals whose attitudes and values reflect a culturally cognizant institution. Nothing less will be accepted by the Mexican-American during the next decade. Nothing less should be accepted by all of our society.

> If, for example, we focus on "disadvantaged institutions"--that schools are "disadvantaged"--not culturally different children--this implies acceptance of the responsibility for inadequate institutions or "institutional deprivation".

It is very clear to those working in community colleges that the nature of the constitutency changes continually. Moen and Stave have alluded to this:[6]

> In all likelihood, many of these urban, youthful citizens will find themselves troubled by agrarian mores and puritan work ethics in a society in which character of labor is changing. Already sociologists point out that modern engineering is doing away with labor as a fact of life, except for the creative, and warn us to prepare for a future as consumers rather than as producers.

---

[5] Rodriquez, A.: "The Mexican-American-Education Profile 70", Chapter One in Educational Programs for By-Passed Populations (Don A. Morgan, editor) Albuquerque and Minneapolis: Southwestern Regional Cooperative Laboratory and the Division of Educational Administration, University of Minnesota. October 1970. Page 12.

[6] Moen, N. W., and Stave, R. L.: "Report of a Conference of Instructors in the Humanities" Minnesota Junior College. Minneapolis: the Report of the 1968 Junior College Faculty Conference, Department of Conferences and Institutes, University of Minnesota. March, 1968. Page 7.

In this vein, I noted at a previous conference:[7]

> Community colleges must anticipate that any immediate community can change in the next 20 years as drastically as some have in the last 20. Furthermore, there is every indication that American society will continue to urbanize with increasingly large percentages of the national population concentrated in urban areas. Given the unsolved social and personal problems now existing in the urban centers of this society, one can be certain that additional movement of inadequately trained people into urban centers, plus the normal increases of populations already residing there and offered minimal education, will bring enormous pressures on social institutions created by the American people to address the total needs of the American community.

And concluded a presentation at the University of California, Los Angeles, with:[8]

> Another consideration is the nearly bewildering pace of social change in recent years. This change can be attributed in great part to enormous population pressures and technological production processes which are mutually complicating. Moreover, social change is never complete in any large modern society. Instead, pockets of people are left behind and isolated by behavioral patterns inadequate to the altered situation. And though B. Lamar Johnson has documented the heartening ability of the two-year college to innovate and experiment, and Erwin Harlacher has described some significant community service programs, there remain the enormous needs of the bypassed people, which must be faced squarely.

---

[7] Morgan, D. A.: "The Meaning of Comprehension," Minnesota Junior College. Minneapolis: The Report of the 1969 Junior College Faculty Conference, Department of Conferences and Institutes, University of Minnesota. 1960. Pages 43-44.

[8] Morgan, D.: "The Junior College President - Role and Responsibility." The Junior College President (B. Lamar Johnson, editor) Los Angeles: Leadership Training Program, The Graduate School of Education, University of California. May 1969. Page 19.

There are those in the field of two-year college work who take the charge perhaps a little too far. A colleague at a major institution reported at a national convention, and later in writing, that the new "community college" would become the "home base social institution". This would seem to suggest the author anticipated the community college as replacing both the family and the church, among other social institutions, and though the remark is properly enthusiastic, it is not well thought out. There is no indication from society they are willing to give to the community college such awesome responsibilities, and there is good evidence in the experiences of public education in general during the 1960's that the community college ought not to ask for additional charges until they can adequately demonstrate they meet or discharge present ones.

The basic premise of this paper is that neither the new nor older two-year colleges have a moral right to use either the words community or comprehensive to describe what they are doing until they have evaluated themselves along some fairly specific and meaningful dimensions (and the following list is not considered definitive but only suggestions):

1. Is the college actually out in the community determining who is not being served by the college or other educational institutions;
2. Is the college aware of who has been excluded by themselves through practices not calculated to exclude but which in effect do (for example simply requiring a written application excludes some);
3. Does the college take programs to the people rather than expect all people to come to them;
4. Does the college allow citizen input in what is to be taught where and by whom, or does it merely pre-define these things and impose;
5. Does the college never close and never stop registering--prescribed hours of attendance, quarters of attendance and credit hours may be only our "bag" and totally irrelevant to the needs of the "real" world;
6. Is the college, or its faculty or its community, dominated by the "little Harvard" mentality of "standards" or by the nearest "major" university;
7. Is the college meaningfully involved in the maintenance struggles of the individuals coming to it or the society supporting it or is it merely perpetuating itself along the lines of least resistance.

Fortunately there are "bell-weather" institutions which have moved out into their communities. Los Angeles City College has a student-counselor program where students immediately out of the ghetto serve as counselors back in the ghetto. Merritt College in Oakland is where the community

has really been invited into college affairs. Baltimore City College and Malcolm X in Chicago have the urban problems of their communities firmly in mind and more importantly firmly included within their curricula. These schools, and others not mentioned, are most deserving of respect because of an unmistakable posture presented to the community -- they mean to help where they can. Little patience is extended those schools presenting unrealistic promises -- those they cannot or will not meet.

If the community college has become only another barrier raising institution then it has failed. If it seeks to become an agent of realistic social change, then there is a chance for success. A comparison with the university here may be of some value.

The university, as an institution, has at least two clear roles assigned by society. It must simultaneously provide for social change and social persistence. In the resolution of these two quite different responsibilities, the university often comes into conflict with the basic society which does not, really, want to change very much at all. Yet most societies are at least sub-consciously aware that they must change or be by-passed. The university, through challenging the present verities and by pursueing pure research, is one of the major sources of the wherewithall by which a society changes; it is a major social change agent. The university is also called on to transmit culture across the chasm of simple human mortality. The community college has no such dual charge, at present. The charge to the community college is most clear in the areas of preparing individuals for the university or for entry into a career, but others do this.

The role of social change agent may, however, be emerging with those schools which are in fact community colleges. These are those colleges which seek to root out and eliminate the general social malaise resulting from promises of equal opportunity and freedom from basic insecurities for all in a society which seems curiously unable to translate the language of democracy into practice. Such colleges by immersion in their communities at a meaningful level, cannot help but become social change agents. This is in no way to suggest the community college ape the university in any fashion nor that it should challenge the roles assigned the university. It is in every way to suggest that the basic role and function of the community college has not been clearly understood in this area, and that there is a "new" and "unique" function to be performed in discharging the responsibilities of being community schools. The inconsistency of a society which has promised much to all and delivered much to not enough must be changed. The community college is in a position to do so if it can but rise to the grand challenge involved.

Translated to the students in the two-year college, it may be they can be a stimulus for honesty. It may be that the honesty they portray in making simple, often heart rending, demands will in the end save the concept of the community college, if we will but listen to them. However there are students and students.

I have little patience with the young who see the excesses of the "system" and seek to destroy this and all other systems. A point is missed that any two people meeting anywhere under circumstances requiring interaction need some frame of reference if they are to react shy of the ultimate freedom of killing each other. To simply do away with the American "establishment", as grim as that conecpt appears to the young, would merely necessitate the super-imposition of another system which would prove in the end to require the application of social power and sanctions. In the process of applying the new system, run by young or old, power would again corrupt.

I have little patience also with the young who are bright, perceptive, sensitive and totally "turned-off" and who have "split the scene". This is a "cop-out" of the worst sort to me. It is true there are many ills in our society, many inconsistencies, much hypocrisy in high and public places -- including community colleges, and it is equally true that these same perceptive and sensitive young people are needed desperately to help correct what has become for them an intolerable situation but which they have no right to leave as intolerable for those to follow.

I have great faith in the young, many in the community college populations, who see the ills of the system, of the American dream denied to many, and who then get back into things and take a crack at what they can do about it.

CONCLUSION:

Success for the community college concept hinges, to me, on its ability to accommodate differences. It is not right, reasonable, proper or perceptive to expect all people to be just like all other people. Communities as with the individuals in them are vastly different, with vastly different aspirations and goals. No one approach is correct for any institution which really seeks to emerge itself in the community. Each successful approach will flow from recognition of a basic oneness -- a commonality and dignity which comes from simply being. Inherent in this is a critical respect for differences. Though committed on paper to serve communities and individuals coming from it, we rarely understand the community or the students as totalities by themselves -- that they possess an inherent worthwhileness. Instead we work most often only with those most amenable to being changed into something like ourselves. This is wrong if it is all we do.

CHAPTER FOUR

A STUDENT LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROJECT

By

Robert Wise[1]

Junior college student leadership programs have problems peculiar to their setting--the "two-year" college. Some of these are: (1) the comparative immaturity of sophomore-freshman leaders compared to the senior-junior leaders of a four-year campus; (2) the requirement that a leadership role be assumed by the student after only one year in an activity; (3) the movement of many high school leaders directly to the four-year campus by-passing the two-year college and limiting background leadership from which to draw; and (4) the nearly 100% turn-over of membership every two years, regardless of the activity.

For the faculty advisor of activities, there are also peculiar problems at the junior college. Because of the rapid turnover in students and the comparative weakness of student leadership, there is a greater dependence of the advisor on traditions and continuity in the junior college activity than there is on a four-year campus, complicated by the fact many two-year colleges are newly formed. Yet, there is still the need for the advisor to teach the traditional independence and self-determination akin to that of higher education as compared to the usual secondary school educational philosophy of paternalism in activities.

To attempt to meet these problems, Rochester State Junior College applied for and received a Federal Title III grant in 1967-68. This grant was renewed in each of the subsequent two years, and the program devised with the grant is now being continued with student activity monies.

The first year, Phase I of the leadership program was a Friday through Sunday weekend in November. The setting was off-campus at a resort. The instruction was given by a staff having previous and extensive work as consultants in leadership to business, industry, and professional groups. Attending Phase I from the Rochester Junior College were all faculty advisors of activities, Student Senate members, and all student presidents or designated leaders of activities. In later sessions the president-elect or leader-elect for each activity were added.

---

[1] Robert Wise is the Director of Activities at Rochester State Junior College, Rochester, Minnesota, which has been in continuous operation since 1915.

Phase II took palce in the winter quarter. In this phase, a faculty-advisor consultant for each club and activity were brought to our campus from colleges throughout the country. These consultants were specialized in a specific activity such as newspaper or Newman Club and spent their time with the advisor and leaders of the same activity on our campus.

Phase III was a repeat, generally, of Phase I. It comprised a weekend in spring quarter and was held off-campus.

The workshops during Phase I were judged effective by all involved. The general areas covered in these workshops were group dynamics, communication, problem solving, decision making, and organization for management. They were conducted with informal sessions that involved much group participation through the assignment of case-study problems to small groups for solution.

The second year of the leadership program was staffed by the same leadership training team during the first and third phases. However, there were additional sessions aimed primarily at faculty-student interaction. The objectives of these sessions were both to analyze the communicative processes that took place within them and to increase the faculty-student communication on problems of concern to both groups.

The second phase of the second year was attended only by the faculty members. It was held at an out-of-town motel. This session, a weekend, was exclusively a sensitivity training session. The results of this session were very favorably received by the participating faculty. An interesting by-play was that faculty at the college not engaged in activity advising and who were not at the sensitivity session were later very curious and envious about the experience.

The third year of the program differed. It was only a one weekend session, and Rochester State Junior College faculty advisors served as the total staff for the meeting. It was programmed in this manner to determine if the program could be continued when financed by local sources. Some of the same subject areas were repeated, but several new topics were also part of the program. These were topics which advisors and students felt were needed but had not been within the particular expertise of the outside consultants used as leadership staff the first two years.

Two of the added topics in the third year were parliamentary law--meeting management and rhetorical theories of probability as pertain to decision making. Also, one long session was devoted to a particular problem of Rochester State Junior College, "The increasing of the intellectual atmosphere on our own campus." Small groups attempted to solve this problem by devising specific projects to be executed in the remainder of the school year.

Our faculty functioned very well in their teaching roles in this third year when compared with the consulting team used in previous years. The faculty later voted overwhelmingly, 64-2, to continue the leadership program the following year at local college expense. One handicap in the third year program was that because of schedule conflicts, the session could not be held until the first week of winter quarter, so the learnings could not be applied as early in the school year as desirable. This experience specifically led to pland for further sessions to be held in the fall quarter on the third weekend.

The important conclusion to be drawn from this leadership training program is that attention to leadership per-se definitely pays dividends. Because the work provided them with personal gain, the students participating in the program were very enthusiastic about the work. The learning gained was of value to them in performing their present responsibility and had carry-over value for their post-college life. Many of the students confessed that never before had they realized that leadership is an art with processes and techniques that vary as applied to each particular problem, task, and group involved. Illustrating the new attitude toward leadership is that student leaders are interested and concerned with more than just publishing an issue of the newspaper, but with the difficulty or ease of publishing each or any issue. It is not uncommon to hear the newspaper editor discussing this aspect with the Senate President.

Many of the faculty advisors also professed a gain in personal learning from the conferences. Those who had had previous training in group dynamics and communication said that they felt the workshop was valuable as a refresher course. The greatest gain for faculty advisors, however, was that they were reminded that the purpose of activities is education for the student, although a few recalcitrant faculty advisors still look upon their sponsored activity as an end in itself.

There is some disappointment that not all faculty advisors felt either the need, or the competency, to continue the leadership training of student leaders in their interest areas after returning to campus. For example, when a problem would develop within some groups, the focus would be on the problem itself rather than the poor leadership qualities that led to the problem.

Another result of this program was a markedly noticeable regeneration of enthusiasm in the student members of most clubs. The time and attention given activities and attention to leadership was increased markedly.

In addition to these rather subjective jusgments of the value of the program, there is some concrete data that can be traced at least partially to the leadership program.

(1) During the 68-69 school year the Student Senate, as a direct result of the Phase I part of the program that year, formed a group called the Student Action Committee. This group performed admirably in working on and with community groups and the local state legislators in achieving certain goals for the student body. The Senate also set up an in-service training program for all Senate candidates that has operated profitably for two years. This is pretty strong evidence of the value that the senators place on leadership training.

(2) Partial credit for the fact junior college senators have gone on to become active in student government at colleges and universities to which they later transferred; three of them became presidents of the student body at four-year institutions, one was re-elected to a second term as president, and another former senator was elected vice-president of his student body. The institutions represented include Rice University, University of Minnesota at Duluth, Bemidji State College, and Hamline University.

(3) The leadership conference also contributed to the successful involvement of students on faculty committees at RSJC. The interaction between the students and faculty at the training sessions led to a mutual respect which encouraged such participation. It also helped create in the students a problem solving attitude which made them want to accept such responsibilities and work.

(4) During past years a principal activity, Sno Week, was led by a queen selected from among activity-sponsored candidates. An approximate nine candidates would be sponsored. This past year twenty different clubs nominated candidates for Sno Queen. Formerly, also, the competition between clubs in the many contests of Sno Week would quickly reduce itself to one or two clubs having a chance of winning the over-all trophy. Since the leadership program was initiated, the competition has come down to the wire with four or five different clubs still in strong competition.

CONCLUSION:

Probably the final concluding piece of evidence as to the success of the leadership program is that in the normal grumbling and discourse over any activity that takes place on a campus, this director has heard no negative feedback toward the over-all leadership program. Considering the normal behavioral patterns of a college institution, this is strong evidence indeed testifying toward the success of leadership training. Clearly success stemmed from involvement, but importantly it was an involvement which transmitted leadership skills as well as interests.